

period, that you are concerned about the length of time that monitoring and activities will continue. And that way, I'll have that for a formal response. Am I -- I'm trying to answer you as best I can right now. I hope that's satisfactory.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You might want to keep in mind that one of the reasons we use -- the potential for that document is, we couldn't say absolutely nothing could come out of here -- you know, waste was put down there for a long, long time, but we're not seeing that now. It's been open and uncontrolled for, you know, a couple decades. We don't expect anything to happen. If something were going to be coming out of the mine, we would expect to see it by now. So to us, the fact that we don't see it now is a pretty strong indication that you're probably not going to see it, particularly if you put a cap over it and eliminate the spreading.

MS. DEPPMAN: The gentleman in the brown and -- did you have a question, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: The proposed fix is limited to the northern portion of the trench?

MR. PANCOAST: Yeah. I mean, if you look at the trench, there would be a little bit of a -- of kind of the central, and then the northern part of the trench. Not the farthest north, right up by the road, because that was not used. But it's kind of the --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Is it everything north of the fault?

MR. PANCOAST: No. There is actually some that's south of the fault. A small zone that was used there, too.

MR. MELEWSKI: Up until recently, the ground water hasn't been -- or, it just started being tested and that type of thing. But up until that point, everything has just been flowing through, or whatever. Any medical studies in the area, as far as potential sicknesses and that type of thing in the area?

MR. SOUTH: No. There have been no medical studies related to this. The Department of Health would have to take that on. And it's, actually, fairly unusual, at least for a model toxic control lab site, that there are large-scale medical studies of any sort with -- I only know of one or two sites, personally, where there have been actual studies. One of them was at the Norseland site, which I'm also involved in. These are both sites I'm involved in. At that site, there were some health questionnaires. The Department of Health has had an ongoing involvement because it's a senior citizens mobile home park located over -- at least partially located over a formal landfill.

The other one that has had much more extensive involvement of the Department of Health, as well as the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry, which is a federal -- anyway, a federal agency. That site is Everett Smelter, where people are actually living on and adjacent to a former smelter. Actually, that smelter operated in 1908 to -- no. When did it operate?

Eight -- I forget. But like 1902 to 1914 or something like that.

And there were, actually, people living directly -- actually, it was a smelter from which the equipment was moved to the Tacoma Smelter, if you've heard of it. But this one is in Everett. And there were actually people living on areas with up to -- I think the highest value found was 72 percent arsenic in a person's yard.

So it's kind of a hot site.

MR. MELEWSKI: Is there a way of getting a medical study done at the area?

MR. SOUTH: The formal answer is, feel free to make that comment, and I will take it up. However, I must tell you that in all practicality, I doubt very much that we would be able to get a medical study going.

MR. MELEWSKI: Okay. Because I'm within one mile of the mine site, itself. And I've lived in a lot of different areas. And this area I've lived in, I know of seven cases of cancer, four of them in children, one in my own daughter, in this recent area, within a one-mile radius of this mine.

MR. PANCOAST: Where do you live? Which site?

MR. MELEWSKI: I live on just 256th and 272nd.

MR. SOUTH: I would appreciate it very much if you would make a formal comment to that effect. And that way, we will respond to it formally.

MR. MELEWSKI: Okay.

MR. SOUTH: And that's the best I can do. I will promise you that I will -- if you make the formal comment, I will take it forward to the proper people, and we'll get it to the Health Department; the Washington Department of Health. Ecology doesn't do the medical studies. But we will do that; I will be sure that that gets to the Washington Department of Health. And from there, I can't -- I don't know what will happen to it, but I will respond formally to that.

MR. MELEWSKI: Okay. Thank you.

MS. DEPPMAN: Any other questions? I guess we'll go ahead.

MR. SOUTH: I have a question.

MS. DEPPMAN: We'll go ahead and accept formal comments -- we have three, and we'll just sort of formally start the formal comment period for the Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study Report for the Landsburg Mine site. And first is Wendy Melewski. Would you stand and -- you can stand right there if it's more comfortable for you.

MS. MELEWSKI: My name is Wendy Melewski. I live at 25620 - 272nd Avenue Southeast, which is east, probably less than a mile, quarter-mile from the north end of the trench. I'm keeping in mind, also, that the RI/FS that is prepared by Golder Associates is on behalf of the PLPs.

As I mentioned, there will always be the potential of chemicals exiting the mine in the ground water. The geophysical data, based on sampling and historical information, suggests the

waste materials in the trench appear to be confined. "Appear." Key word. This is not a guarantee that the ground water won't be affected or has been, you know. We don't know. We do not know that any act of Mother Nature could not open up a seam, which, in effect, could contaminate any private wells in any direction around the seam. There will always be that potential. And I feel, as a landowner, I should continue to have my private well monitored at the PLP's expense. Never in my wildest dreams did I realize, when I bought 10 acres and built my dream home and raised my family, I was doing all this next to a toxic waste dump.

If Alternative 5 is used as opposed to No. 9, which is extremely cost-effective to the PLPs, I would like to see it added that there is continued private well monitoring. I, personally, would be happy with a once-a-year monitoring with the seasonal rotation, such as in '96 it's checked in the winter, '97, spring, so on and so forth. I feel that I'm the loser because of my decreased land value and the potential that's always out there of contaminated drinking water, and I feel I'm asking very little for this continued monitoring, you know, to make me feel better. What was it you said I should really bring up?

MR. SOUTH: You mentioned your concern about the 20 years.

MS. MELEWSKI: Oh, my concern about the 20 years, because the potential is always going to be there. No matter what alternative is used, the potential is always there for contamination, and I think 20 years is just -- that's nothing, you know. It should be a lifetime -- or, more than a lifetime. It should be indefinite, in my opinion.

MS. DEPPMAN: Thank you. And next is Bill Wolinski, City of Kent.

MR. WOLINSKI: I'm Bill Wolinski. I'm with the Department of Public Works, City of Kent, Environmental Engineering. The City just recently received the RI/FS report, and we are arranging for an independent peer review of the report to enable us to provide adequate comments on the report.

The City has a tremendous responsibility with regard to this site. Our major drinking water supply, Clark Springs, is located adjacent to the site along Rock Creek. It's a valuable, irreplaceable resource. And by "irreplaceable," I mean that this region is facing a water crisis. There is a moratorium on water rights in the whole area. If our water supply becomes contaminated, it's virtually irreplaceable. We are concerned, not just in the short run, but the long run. And any Cleanup Action Plan that's presented will be tremendously scrutinized with regard to our responsibility in protecting the water supply for both the current generations and future generations. And we will be looking at this from that vantage point. We're going to prepare formal comments, but I just wanted to make a statement in the record, as far as our intent.

MS. DEPPMAN: Thank you. Richard, did you want to make your comment?

MR. MELEWSKI: Yes.

MS. DEPPMAN: Richard Melewski.

MR. MELEWSKI: I just wanted to make a comment that there should be some type of a study or some type of a -- something done about the medical in the area; see if there has been any -- just from what I know -- just from neighbors, this is what I know, you know, and it seems to be an extreme amount. I'm not saying that's what caused it, but it should be looked into, in some type of a -- I don't know how they go about checking out an area, but -- well, I guess we'll go about it and find out how.

I know seven people in the area, in the one-mile area of the mine, and like I said, four are children, and one of them is our daughter, and it doesn't run in our family. The cancer doesn't run in our family. So you know, we don't know -- like I said, the wells have not been monitored until recently, and we've been there, you know, before that time. So basically --

MS. DEPPMAN: Thank you. Does anyone else want to make a formal comment? Okay. We'll conclude that.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I guess I would like to make a comment.

MS. DEPPMAN: Okay. State your name and address, and I'll have you fill out a card.

MR. BECK: My name is William Beck, and I'm the Chair of the Greater Maple Valley Area Council. And you folks have made presentations to us in the past. I was not aware of a potential medical problem. But it appears, based on this gentleman's testimony, that some sort of an epidemiological study would certainly be called for, and I would like to make that comment tonight.

MS. DEPPMAN: Okay, thank you. Okay. We can continue with some questions if there are some, or we will certainly stay after the meeting if you'd like to just talk to people one-on-one. Is there a preference? Do you want to ask a few more questions?

MR. THOMAS: I'd just like to make a statement. Not an official statement. I'm State Representative Brian Thomas. I represent you out here. And I just want to let you know that I am concerned about this. If you have any questions, or you need me to nudge this process along, I'm interested in this, so be sure and give me a call.

MS. DEPPMAN: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: One question I had is: You're obviously recording all of this. Will we be able to get the minutes of this meeting?

MS. DEPPMAN: Certainly. Anyone that would like a copy, we can make a copy of the transcript for you, and we can also put them in the Maple Valley Library for people to look at.

MR. SOUTH: There may be, if it runs over 25 pages, a charge. What happens is, we will get the transcript; we'll put it in our records. In fact, all of the files on this site are in our central records, and they are all open. There might be -- we do have things called "exempt" files that are not -- that are exempt from public disclosure. I don't think there is anything much on this site that's exempt. Typically, on the sites I work on, the things that are in the exempt file are something from the Attorney General's Office that comes on their letterhead that says, "We've assigned this attorney to the site." And since it's got AG letterhead, it goes in the exempt file.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I can get the address off of here and request --

MR. SOUTH: Absolutely.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: -- the minutes?

MR. SOUTH: Yes.

MS. DEPPMAN: Wendy?

MS. MELEWSKI: I was curious if the RI/FS and the Landsburg Mine site volumes will continue to always remain at the library. And, say, once, you know, they get going on one of the alternatives, I imagine that would go there. But say, anything they do, whether it's after it's capped and, say, one year they come out and they check it, will that kind of information be sent to the library?

MR. SOUTH: Not usually. Usually, if you want to see that, you are going to have to come into our Bellevue office.

MS. MELEWSKI: But your office will always know what is going on, or do they have to inform you every time they go out there, and everything that they do?

MR. SOUTH: They will be reporting to us. Oh, yes. It will be a formal schedule and a plan, a sampling schedule, and what will be sampled for, and the results will come in. We don't typically go out publicly with the results.

MS. DEPPMAN: Unless there is something new.

MR. SOUTH: Well, typically -- typically, once you get into a real long-term monitoring, if something came up, probably, and we were going to require something additional, then we'd probably have to have something that would trigger a public comment. I'm not sure that there is actually anything formally required. I mean, like what I pointed out were things that are formally required under the law, for public comment. Actually, we do a lot more on many, many sites than is formally required. And if something came up that we felt people would know about -- you know, I have to couch this -- we would probably do something. But if it's 10 years from now, and I'm not here, and it's not required by the law, I can't say the law will trip in and require that, so that's why I'm being so cautious.

MS. DEPPMAN: I would say, if there were -- certainly if there were human health impacts, you would be notified.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's what I was going to say. Although we are not obligated to, but if we had a question of policy or something like that, they are not going to certainly sweep it under the rug.

MR. SOUTH: We're going to be moving pretty fast.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Yeah. And be notifying --

MR. SOUTH: Everybody involved in this is going to be wanting to move very fast, including the PLPs.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Marianne, I guess I'd like to make a statement.

MS. DEPPMAN: A formal comment?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Sure.

MS. DEPPMAN: We're sorting of flexing in and out of formal comments.

MR. SOUTH: That's all right.

MS. DEPPMAN: Go ahead. State your name, please.

MR. WOODRIF: My name is Ed Woodruff, and I lived close to that mine for a number of years. My well is a surface well only 20-some-odd feet deep, and I'm probably within -- oh, I don't know, I'm closer to Rick and Wendy. I'm maybe three or four hundred yards from the mine. I was surprised to hear that it's only 750 feet deep. I had heard it was 1,100 feet deep. And I can't, in my wildest imagination, imagine how anything 750 feet deep is going to run uphill in my 20-foot-deep well, and my property is higher than the property where the contamination is. Any water that runs off of my property is going to run towards the mine, not away from the mine.

It's interesting that since this has been happening for 30-some-odd years, that most all of that that's going to come out of there has come out of there. I mean, it's not a runoff. As it flows through, it's going to get less and less and less every year. It's not going to get more and more every year. And how in the world it would affect my well or any of my neighbors' wells, I don't know. I was curious as to how deep your well is from the City of Kent down there. Do you know?

MR. WOLINSKI: Between 1,500 and 1,200 feet. Different depths.

MR. WOODRIF: See, so you're even above the contaminant.

MS. DEPPMAN: Could we just have your comments, sir, and then we can --

MR. SOUTH: We need to be making formal comments in here, so --

MR. WOODRIF: Anyway, that's my comment. It sounds like it's very well contained. It's running through a coal filter element, and a cap on the top of it is going to keep water from coming in and flushing it out further. It seems like a logical solution. That's my comment.

MS. DEPPMAN: Thank you.

MR. SOUTH: We don't want to cut you off. I mean, that's the end of your formal comment. If you want to have some more conversation, of course feel free. It's --

MR. WOODRUFF: Okay.

MS. DEPPMAN: Okay. We'll stay around to at least 9:00. And then just a reminder. Then Dave, following the end of the comment period -- and we still have until April the 12th, I believe it is. Yes. To send written comments in. And I don't think we would reject them if they came in on the 14th or something. But certainly --

MR. SOUTH: If you can't get something in by the 12th, but you want to get something in, give us a call. I'm, actually, taking some leave. But certainly, as soon as I get back from that, I'll want to be wrapping this up. So there is a limit. But if you want to make another comment, and it's April 11th, just give a call and say, "I've got another one coming in." But obviously, once I get the report -- the responsiveness summary wrapped up, it's going to be too late. You know, it's not like, midnight on the 12th, we're going to say, "That's it."

MS. DEPPMAN: So what happens is, Dave responds to all comments; the ones that were made here. And then the ones that we receive in writing, he writes his responses and then makes a decision about approving the report, or based on -- if any changes are going to be made based on comments, he will make that determination. And then the Cleanup Action Plan --

MR. SOUTH: Then we'll move forward into the Cleanup Action Plan and develop the cleanup actions, including the monitoring and that sort of thing. And then we will come back out for another public meeting and do this again.

MS. DEPPMAN: So there will be another opportunity before the actual work starts on the cleanup of the site, for you to comment.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Any idea of the time line on that?

MS. DEPPMAN: On the document itself? If cleanup is going to start --

MR. SOUTH: Bob had a slide on that, and so maybe he remembers. What he picked out was, try to get going in the construction season of '97 for any actual --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So before the actual construction, it will be another --

MS. DEPPMAN: Yeah. Probably a good number of months before that, since you need to bid everything. So probably early '97 if all goes as we hope it does right now. And if you'd like to get a copy of the responsiveness summary for this comment period, we will mail it to all people who comment. But if you want one just for your own information, let me know. I'll mail you one of those, which generally aren't too lengthy, depending on the number of comments.

MR. SOUTH: No. I don't think we're going to get -- we're not going to get 250 comments on Landsburg, I don't think. I hope not.

MS. DEPPMAN: Okay. Thanks for coming. I appreciate your participation.

(Whereupon, the proceedings
concluded at 8:50 p.m.)

[illegible]

AFFIDAVIT

STATE OF WASHINGTON)
)
COUNTY OF PIERCE)

As Court Reporter and Notary Public, I hereby certify that the foregoing transcript includes all the facts, matters, and proceedings occurring at a hearing, conference, or other matter held on March 27, 1996, in Maple Valley, Washington, at the hour of 7:00 p.m.

Notary Public in and for the
State of Washington,
residing at Puyallup, Washington.
(Notary expires: 1-19-98)

